HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

DIVISION BENCH

CORAM: **HON'BLE SHRI H.L. DATTU, CJ. &**
HON'BLE SHRI V.K. SHRIVASTAVA, J.

Writ Petition No. 2603 of 2002

PETITIONERS

1. Narayan Prasad Agrawal
   S/o Giridhari Lal Agrawal
   Ages about 45 years,
   R/o Mahasati Ward,
   Bhatapara (C.G.)
   Occupation : Trading Business
   (Dal Mill)
2. Dilip Chhabaria, S/o Lakhan Lal Chhabaria, Aged about 36 years, R/o Bajrang Ward, Bhatapara
   Occupation : Business
3. Kamal Tiwari, S/o Late Shri Shravan Kumar Tiwari, Aged about 35 years, R/o Shankar Ward, Bhatapara

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. The State of Chhattisgarh
   Through Local Welfare Department
   D.K. Bhavan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Collector, Raipur
3. Pranita Pandey
   The President, Nagar Palika,
   Bhatapara
4. The Chief Minicipal Officer,
   Nagar Palika, Bhatapara

Present: Dr. Shailesh Ahuja, counsel for the petitioners.
Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal and Shri Saurabh Sahni, counsel for the respondent No.3.

ORAL ORDER

(Passed on 03rd April, 2007)

The following oral order of the Court was passed by

H.L. Dattu, CJ.

The petitioners are residents of Bhatapara. They are public spirited citizens and also tax payers.

(2) In this petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners allege that the Chief Municipal Officer and the President of the Municipal Council, Bhatapara have misused the powers conferred on them for personal gains. Therefore, a request is made to enquire and to investigate into the matter and then remove the Chief Municipal Officer and the President of Municipal Council.

(3) In the petition so filed, the petitioners have not come with the full particulars and details required to investigate the so-called misuse of powers by the Chief Municipal Officer and the President of the Municipal Council. In the absence of material particulars, we cannot be directing the respondents to answer to the allegations made by the petitioners in this writ petition. In our opinion, the allegations made in the petition are bald and those bald allegations cannot be taken into consideration by us by giving any relief to the petitioners.

(4) In that view of the matter, the writ petition requires to be rejected and it is rejected. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
V.K. Shrivastava
Judge

Sd/-
Chief Justice